

### REMARKS

Applicant has corrected the typographical error in Claim 1, step (c). A corrected set of claims is attached hereto.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trager, Bersted et al., Johnson, Schachter and either Garr or Kreckel et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Trager describes sewing segment 42 onto the background fabric 20. Applicant does not sew her fabric design pattern to the backing material. Rather an outline of the desired design pattern is stitched onto the backing material top surface.

Bersted et al. discloses a polymeric fabric used as a carpet yarn. Bersted et al. requires the needling of carpet tufts into the backing. In contrast, applicant merely stitches an outline of the desired design pattern onto polymeric backing material.

Johnson describes sewing the fabric base material to the appliqué. Applicant does not sew her design to the backing material. Applicant merely stitches an outline of the desired design onto a polymeric backing material and applicant's design is permanently glued to the backing material not temporarily applied as in Johnson.

Garr discloses securing a wall adornment to a wall. It

does not relate to the use of double sided tape so the design can be easily removed and remounted.

Kreckel et al. discloses a removable adhesive tape but does not disclose the use of double sided tape as in applicant's invention.

Taking Trager, Bersted et al., Johnson, Schachter, Garr and Kreckel et al. together and considering them as a whole, they teach a method of sewing a design on a polymeric backing and placing a removable adhesive tape on the back of the polymeric backing. In contrast, applicant's method of Claims 1 and 4 stitches with thread an outline of the desired design pattern onto the backing material top surface after gluing a desired fabric design pattern to the backing material top surface. Applicant applies a double sided sticky tape to a back surface of the backing material so that the desired design can be stuck to a wall surface and easily removed therefrom. None of the references of record teach stitching with thread an outline of the desired design pattern onto the backing material top surface. Instead, these references require the sewing of the design layer to the backing layer.

Applicant's product becomes a permanent stencil and allows applicant to manufacture multitudes of the same finished product by using the same patterned stencils over and over again. Trager's must be repeated step by step for each of the

same designated finished product. Trager's sewing of pieces together along curves and sharp angles of decompressed tracing boundaries through layers of fabric requires fabric manipulation of a skilled sewing professional. Applicant's stitching solely of an outline on the backing material (polypropylene) eliminates the more difficult Trager method.

In view of these differences between the several references taken together and applicant's method steps, it is not believed that applicant's method was made obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1 and 4 based on these references should be withdrawn.

The Examiner further rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to Claim 1 and further in view of Place et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Place et al. relates to the use of double sided tape in repairing automotive bodies. It has nothing to do with methods of preparing a removable decorative design for mounting on a wall. As such, the reference is inappropriate for use in rejecting applicant's method. Neither Garr nor Kreckel suggest the use of a double sided tape in a method for mounting a removable decorative device on a wall. Further, as stated above, the references as cited, even if Place et al. were taken together with them, fail to teach applicant's method steps, particularly, the stitching of a

design outline on a backing sheet of polypropylene. For this reason, the rejection of Claim 2 should be withdrawn.


The Examiner rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the references cited in paragraph 4 of the Examiner's office action and further in view of Park et al. This rejection is traversed. Admittedly, Park et al. describes the placement of a piezoelectric film on a novelty item. Taking Park et al. and considering this reference as a whole together with the references of paragraph 4, they fail to teach applicant's method steps because there is no stitching with thread on the backing material around the outline of the desired design pattern with a music chip mounted on a top surface of the decorative design by stitching a fabric cover over the chip as set forth in applicant's Claim 3. Therefore, applicant's method could not have been made obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). For this reason, the rejection of Claims 3 should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the paragraph 4 references and further in view of Zerilli. Admittedly, Zerilli disclosed a cotton material in a decorative fabric design. Claim 5, depending from Claim 1, is patentable for the same reason as Claim 1; namely, because taking the paragraph 4 references together with Zerilli the resulting method fails to disclose the method of adhering a

decorative cotton fabric to a polymeric backing material and stitching an outline of the desired design onto the backing material. Since these references fail to teach applicant's steps, they cannot make applicant's method of Claim 5 obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). For this reason the rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of all the above it is believed that Claims 1-5 are now in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Herbert W. Larson  
Registration No. 21,088  
Attorney for Applicant  
Customer No. 22497

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8**

I, Michelle Larson, hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "First Class Mail" service under 37 C.F.R. §1.8 on the date indicated below in an envelope addressed to the **Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop Amendment, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

Date:

10-13-06

  
MICHELLE LARSON